DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 792 CG 013 899

TITLE	Alternative Education Options.
INSTITUTION	Center for Action Research, Inc., Boulder, Colo.; Little (Arthur D.), Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 79
CONTRACT	J-LEAA-013-77
NOTE	62p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Alternatives; Educational Experience; Elementary Secondary Education; Guides; *Program Development; Program Planning; *School Community Relationship; School Districts; *School Personnel; *Student School Relationship; Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

This guide deals with various areas of alternative education programs, including current practices and different options available to school and community personnel. Steps are outlined to assess present educational settings, design new programs, select the participants, and implement and evaluate the new program. The first appendix contains sources of information for citizen groups, teachers, administrators, school district personnel, staff members and school board members. Information is provided concerning alternatives education organizations, youth agency programs, national legislation, law enforcement assistance, and legislation to provide money to support public employment. The names, addresses, and phone numbers of contact persons are provided. The second appendix contains an annotated bibliography of references pertinent to the many facets of alternative education. (Author/BMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178792

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION OPTIONS

Prepared For

The Office of Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

U.S. Department of Justice

This project was supported by Contract Number J-LEAA-013-77, awarded to Arthur D. Little, Inc., Washington, D.C., and the Center for Action Research, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

JANUARY, 1979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG013899

This report was prepared by Arthur D. Little, Inc. and its subcontractor, the Center for Action Research, for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, under LEAA Contract Number J-LEAA-013-77.

Pamela Fenrich, Project Director, Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Paul Bradshaw, Regional Coordinator, Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Judith Little, Center for Action Research
Lisa Berger, Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Ann Sargeant, Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Ka'Sandra Davenport, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	1
Chapter I - INTRODUCTION	3
What Do We Mean by "Alternative?"	3
Chapter II - CURRENT PRACTICE	5
Programs of Individual Change	5
Suspension and Expulsion	5
Time-Out Rooms	7
Behavior Contracts	7
Work Assignments	8
Compensatory or Remedial Education	8
Tutoring	8
Improving School Climate: A Case History	9
Independent Alternative Schools	11
Chapter III - SORTING OUT THE OPTIONS	13
Getting Started	14
What Kinds of Participation?	15
Assess the Present Situation	16
Design a Program	18
Specific Requirements	19
Selecting the Participants	20

Volunteers 22

Money 22

Make A Plan 23

Make It Happen: Implementation 23

Inservice Training 26

Where Did We Go Wrong? 27

Summary 28

APPENDIX A: SOURCES OF INFORMATION 31

APPENDIX B: REFERENCES 38

PREFACE

This report, originally developed for the Florida Center for Children and Youth, Inc., examines the development of alternative education programs. It is meant to be used by lay citizen groups, teachers, administrators, district supervisors and curriculum development specialists, superintendents, school board members, and the Florida Department of Education staff as they develop educational alternatives throughout the state.

The Florida Center for Children and Youth, has been strongly committed to the concept of alternative education since its beginning as a statewide child advocacy organization. The concerns of the Board of Directors arise from the belief that all children in Florida deserve and are in need of a quality education, an education that will prepare them to assume a useful role in a complex and changing society. Yet schools have been unable to keep pace with the increasing demands that have been placed upon them. The following figures dramatize a situation which is both a problem and an opportunity:

- 41,311 students dropped out of school during the 1976-77 school year in Florida.
- 91,563 of Florida's children were not promoted to the next grade level at the end of the school year 1976-77.
- 63,047 Florida public school students were suspended from school for at least one school day during 1976-77.
- School suspensions resulted at a minimum in a loss of over 80,251 student days of instruction during the 1976-77 school year.
- 416 Florida public school students were expelled during the 1976-77 academic year.
- 199,249 students received corporal punishment in Florida during the 1976-77 school year.

Not visible in these statistics are the thousands of young people and teachers who find their school an unrewarding or difficult place to spend the day. Nationwide, students and teachers alike have almost one chance in 10 of having something stolen each month and about one chance in 200 of being robbed. Students stand almost one chance in 80 of being physically attacked; for teachers, the chance is one in 200. Similarly, far more students are discouraged, humiliated, frightened, disinterested, alienated, and angry than are revealed by official figures; teachers in large numbers are frustrated, angry, helpless -- and leaving their jobs.

While such statistics paint an unhappy picture, and one which clearly indicates a need for action, they also suggest an opportunity for improving our schools and improving the lives and prospects of the students, teachers, and administrators who spend their days there.

During the 1978 legislative session, the Florida Center for Children and Youth worked in coalition with many other organizations and groups throughout the state to construct a concept of alternative education which would work toward the elimination of the failures of our present educational system. In response to the lively interest of citizen advocates, the legislature -- as a first step -- passed legislation which will assist districts in the development of alternatives for students who are disinterested, unsuccessful, or disruptive in the traditional school setting. This legislative effort provides the initial impetus in Florida's search for solutions to the problems that children face in our educational system.

The Florida Center for Children and Youth is greatly appreciative of the technical assistance offered to Florida in the preparation of this report. The Center wishes to extend its special thanks to consultant Paul Bradshaw of Arthur D. Little, Inc., and to Dr. Judith Warren Little of the Center for Action Research, Inc. Their efforts have not only given us a national perspective of the state of the art of alternatives in America, but have shown us that developing alternatives within Florida is a realistic goal. Consultations with Ruby King of Florida Teaching Profession/National Education Association, Woody Darden and Harold Cramer of Florida Association School Administrators and Dale Hilburn, Phil Rountree, Vicky Rickards, Jim Crocher and others in the Department of Education have all proved helpful in the production of this report. Our thanks to Rita Thrasher, co-founder of the Florida Consortium on Options in Public Education (COPE), for her assistance in preparing bibliographic annotations.

Concern is a most critical beginning -- education of ourselves as educators and advocates and involvement in the process of change are the next steps. It is hoped that this manual can begin to fulfill our efforts as advocates. It is only through these steps that we will make progress toward the achievement of Florida's dream ... a comprehensive quality education for all.

Sharon Solomon

Sharon Solomon, Executive Director
Florida Center for Children and Youth
Tallahassee, Florida

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

What influence can the schools reasonably expect to exert over problems of failure, truancy, disruption, disinterest, violence, vandalism, and the like? What solutions are within the reach and control of the school, and how can they be designed? This report addresses these questions by offering guidelines for developing alternative education programs.

A good approach to these questions is to ask not why young people get into trouble, but how do they grow into healthy, productive adults? Here are some basic propositions:

- Young people become productive adults because society provides them with opportunities to feel useful, competent, a sense of belonging, and capable of influencing their immediate futures. In schools, students can gain recognition and admiration from teachers and fellow students, and these opportunities can be expanded to offer more students a chance to belong.

- Young people are likely to grow up to be productive adults when they see themselves and are seen by others in positive ways.

- Negative labels and limited access to desirable opportunities and roles lead to alienation. Such young people have little stake in conforming to rules or trying to achieve, so delinquency, dropping out, truancy, classroom disruption, and even running away may follow.

These propositions suggest the school situation increases the chance that students will act in ways that are illegal, immoral, ugly, or self-defeating. This perspective has some clear implications for changing situations rather than individuals. The three basic propositions can be viewed as general principles for judging any proposed course of action. A program is positive (rather than punitive) if it broadens opportunities for students to belong, to be useful and responsible, and to be seen in a favorable light by others.

What Do We Mean By "Alternative?"

In its broadest sense, an alternative often turns out to be anything you haven't tried before: literally, anything different. While popular writing on alternative education stresses the underlying idea of expanded choice for everyone -- students, teachers, parents, administrators -- as many as 30 percent of the programs in the United States have been estimated to serve a "special" sub-population of students: the disruptive, disinterested, disaffected, and disaffiliated. Teachers, principals, students, and parents may all have different notions of what constitutes an alternative.

For some, alternative education requires separate facilities and independence from the policies and rules of the conventional public schools; for others, alternative education includes the remedial reading and math programs for students with academic problems, or the in-school suspension program for students who are considered behavior problems.

Alternative education should create situations that expand access to opportunities. This is an argument for organizational change; it does not exclude the possibility that individual students may need support and help of one sort or another, but implies that any approach which does not aim for situational change is too narrow.

Chapter II

CURRENT PRACTICE

The following examples of alternative edcuation programs fall into two main groups. The first group consists of programs intended to control and change the behavior of individual students. Traditional suspension and expulsion policies are included here, as are in-school suspension programs, behavior contracts, work assignments (as restitution), counseling, tutoring, compensatory education, time-out rooms. Such programs have shown mixed success in changing the behavior of individuals students.

A second set of approaches is directed at altering the school environment itself to make it possible for more students to succeed, and to eliminate some of the factors that contribute to truancy, disinterest, dropping out, failure, violence and vandalism. These approaches have been described as "improving school climate," though separate alternative schools, schools within schools, and other efforts are included.

Programs of Individual Change

These programs are directed at changing the behavior of students by altering their attitudes, skills, knowledge, or emotional adjustment. Entry into the program is typically by diagnosis and referral.

Suspension and Expulsion

Traditional policies of suspension and expulsion rely on exclusion from school as punishment for certain (presumably extreme) violations of school rules.

Clearly, some behavior cannot be permitted or tolerated, such as harming people or their property. In-school suspension is used by some school districts as a disciplinary alternative to out-of-school suspension or explusion. It is intended for a limited number of days to isolate physically and socially those students who engage in disruptive behavior in the classroom or hallways, students who cut classes or who are truant, and students who for other disciplinary reasons have come to the attention of the dean or principal. These programs often evolve into programs handling youth disciplined for a variety of minor offenses.

In-school suspension programs, with few exceptions, are not intended or organized to be an intensive remedial program for students, offering academic and other services. The central feature of these programs is physical and social isolation. Students are isolated from social and academic activities by being assigned to the in-school center where they spend the day entirely in one room. If they go to the cafeteria for lunch, they do so at a different time than the rest of the students. Lunch may be brought to the students. They are escorted to the lavatories.

Typically, they are not permitted to participate in extracurricular activities while assigned to the in-school center. In many of the centers, no interaction is permitted among the students; the exception is in programs combining limited remedial instruction or counseling as part of the program.

Most in-school centers have no specific program. Classroom teachers prepare assignments from regular classroom work to be completed by students in the in-school program. A list is generally circulated each school morning, identifying students assigned to in-school suspension. Teachers prepare assignments to occupy the student for the number of days he or she will be in the center. When there is a lag between the time the student is assigned and the time the classroom work becomes available, the teacher-supervisor may use a stock of general purpose written assignments.

The average length of stay in such a program is three days, with most districts calling for a minimum of one day and a maximum of ten. Re-entry to regular classes may be at the discretion of the dean or principal, may rely on recommendations from the teacher-supervisor, may require a parent conference, or may occur simply when assigned work is completed.

Two problems are common with in-school suspension. First, teachers are glad to get troublesome students out of the classroom but are less willing to prepare a set of assignments for the student in the in-school center. Second, teachers in some programs may take advantage of the program by excluding students from their classes for quite minor misbehavior. The program seems to give permission to classroom teachers to cease efforts to cope with problems in the classroom. This latter problem is avoided by establishing a standard set of criteria governing admission to the program. Criteria may include:

- Specifications of the behavior for which students will be assigned to the program.
- Specifications of the terms under which a student participates in the center, including agreements on the part of teachers to provide work.
- Terms of exclusion from the program (suspension or expulsion).
- Terms of re-entry into class.

While out-of-school suspensions and lost school days are reduced to this type of program, it does not necessary deter other students or reduce trouble at school. In some schools, there is a slight increase in the drop-out rate accompanying the implementation of the program.

Programs that isolate troublesome youth run the risk of producing further trouble by negatively labeling program participants and reducing their chances to participate in school in positive ways. However, this short-term, in-school suspension may be less stigmatizing than a longer term placement in a separate "treatment" program.

Time-Out Rooms

In many schools, in-school suspension and time-out rooms amount to the same thing. The distinguishing features are:

- Time-out rooms may be used at the discretion of the student as well as at the discretion of teachers and administrators.
- Time-out rooms are more likely than in-school suspension centers to offer counseling and to be oriented around working out difficulties rather than punishing misdeeds.
- Time-out rooms are more likely to be set up as comfortable places in which a student can retreat, cool off, think things through, or work out a written plan for improving relations with one or more teachers.

The book, Schools Without Failure, outlines procedures for 'timing out' in elementary and secondary schools that include:

- In elementary classrooms, create a space where students can sit comfortably (e.g., overstuffed chair, cushioned area on the floor).
- In secondary schools, a chair and table or desk could be placed in an unused open space or in the hallway.
- Students do not actively participate in the class, although they may listen.
- Students who break their isolation are further separated from classroom activities.
- Students may not rejoin a class until they have devised a plan for following the rules that is acceptable to teacher and student.

Behavior Contracts

A behavior contract is an agreement between a student and a teacher or principal which is jointly negotiated, written, and signed by both parties. The school principal may use a printed contract form which specifies a disruptive incident, the general promise not to engage in such behavior in the future, and specific agreements made with the student.

Here are some suggestions for contracting procedures:

- Specify the role to be played by teachers and parents, as well as the student. In order to fulfill the agreement satisfactorily for example, students may request that a tutor be provided in math or reading, or that parents take part in scheduling homework. All relevant parties (not just the student) could sign the contract.

- Specify a time frame for the contract, so that progress can be judged and recorded. Upon successful completion of the contract, good news about the student should be put into the student's records and should be conveyed to teachers.

- Construct the agreements with the student so that they reflect reasonable expectations for improved work and behavior. A student who is chronically truant may be set up for failure if the agreement reads "never cut class again." The prospects for success are improved if the agreement starts by expecting the student not to cut classes for the next two weeks.

Work Assignments

Having a student work for the school or community is one way of responding to disruption. The work assignment should offer the opportunity for the student to be useful and productive in an arena other than the classroom. Work assignment as a program strategy does not require additional funding, space, or paid staff. It does require planning to identify a range of potential work assignments which can be handled on a short-term basis, to find adults to supervise the students, and to establish the criteria governing the operations of the program. This option may work best in combination with the behavior contracts discussed above.

Compensatory or Remedial Education

Compensatory or remedial programs are based on the assumption that help in remedying deficiencies will improve the student's chances of success, will increase the student's stake in good attendance, and will lead to less classroom disruption. These remedies are most effective in special programs outside the regular classroom.

Compensatory education is a program strategy aimed at correcting the deficiencies of individuals or groups; alternative education is aimed at altering the situations in which young people learn. But these differences may be blurred by the occasional compensatory education program that works for change in general practices of teaching and learning, or by the alternative education programs that operate entirely on a compensatory or remedial model.

Tutoring

Some schools have organized volunteer tutoring programs which make extensive use of parents, university students, and high school students. Tutoring programs do not require that tutors themselves be excellent students; any interested student is eligible. Tutors may even be recruited from among the failures -- students who are reading two or three years below grade level and who are consistently among the lowest in class ranking. Thus the tutors themselves may make substantial gains in academic skills and improve their relationships with their teachers.

Tutoring programs can be organized, scheduled, and supervised by parent-volunteer coordinators, using odd corners of existing school facilities.

Improving School Climate - A Case History

Cleveland High School in Seattle, Washington, was plagued by alarmingly high rates of violence, vandalism, absenteeism and dropouts. Police entering the school were threatened and insulted, and in one school riot, a police car was burned. The school principal made a conscious, strategic decision to turn the school around and to enlist the participation of students and teachers. Over a period of three years, the principal, William Maynard, and the students and teachers of Cleveland High took the following steps:

- Created an "I've Got Pride" campaign that included everything from campaign buttons to student-designed and student-painted designs and murals on hallway, classroom, and cafeteria walls.

- Recruited students who were leaders in the various cliques in the school -- students who influenced the behavior of others, whether for good or ill -- and met with them to begin to establish trust and open communication and to develop concrete ideas for improving the school.

- Held a series of workshops with staff to improve communication skills, shared decision-making, problem solving, and group process skills. A regular in-service program, organized around the practical problems shared by teachers, helped overcome resistance by showing teachers concrete things they could do to succeed in the school's new and more open atmosphere.

- Reviewed school rules and reduced them to six basic rules:

  -- Attend class
  -- No alcohol or drugs
  -- No weapons
  -- No gambling
  -- No smoking in the building
  -- Treat all with respect for their dignity, welfare, and material goods.

- Recruited students and teachers to participate, through committees, in the important decisions affecting school life. Students and teachers participated in interviews of staff applicants and in budget development committees.

- Expanded the curriculum through the use of minicourses.

- Modified grading policy to eliminate failing grades, with credit awarded for work completed, and in increments of 1/4 credit. Teachers selected grading procedures, based on grades (A,B,C,D,/ no credit), a combination of a grades-pass-no credit (A,B,pass/no

credit), pass/no credit, or a mastery checklist.

And what were the results? Here are some of the effects as reported in The School Discipline Desk Book:

- The average percentage of pupils absent each period decreased from 35% to 5.6%.
- Library circulation tripled in three years.
- Requests for transfers out of Cleveland dropped dramatically.
- The number of fights, both between individuals and between racial groups decreased markedly.
- Office referrals dropped by 50%.
- Discipline problems in the school declined to such an extent that security officers were no longer assigned to the school while it was in session. Also, staff no longer had to patrol halls, supervise washrooms, or monitor the cafeteria.
- Previously assemblies could not be held because of problems with student conduct. Ten assemblies were held last year.
- Pupils no longer were required to attend a supervised study hall. Instead they had a choice of leaving the campus or going to the library or the cafeteria.
- Outsiders coming into the school to sell dope or otherwise cause trouble were still a problem. However, Cleveland students were informing outsiders that they were not welcome and told them to stay out of the building.
- Previously, anyone in a uniform coming into the school was subjected to threats and insults. This changed such that military recruiters and uniformed police could visit the building regularly with no serious problems.
- Sixty percent of Cleveland's graduating class enrolled in college - up form 35% five years ago.

The Cleveland High School experience suggests that the following features are clues to whether a school is set up for success:

- The tone set by the principal. Schools described as "successful" are likely to have principals who spend a lot of time out of their offices, in the halls, classrooms, playground, and cafeteria; who sit with students at lunch; who talk with a range of studnets informally in halls and classrooms (and not only when there is trouble); who know the names and some of the interests of many

students; and who involve students and teachers in the work of improving the school.

- The expectations for students performance held by teachers. Greater success and less trouble (absences, disruptions, etc.) are found where teachers firmly believe that students can and will learn and where teachers believe they can work with even the most difficult students. Students who succeed in an alternative program but fail in a conventional program frequently point to relationships with teachers as the critical factor.

- The range of opportunities to succeed. The greater the number and kinds of opportunities for students to gain recognition, to feel useful and competent, the greater the chance the students will develop a stake in doing well. Curriculum options based on interest and choice (rather than assignment), limitations on course prerequisites, using students as tutors, using students to maintain and improve the school (everything from assisting with office work to painting to participating in budget committees to running the cafeteria) all represent opportunities for students to demonstrate and build competence.

- The physical appearance and atmosphere of the school. Successful schools tends to be those where students and teachers alike feel they are welcome. In some schools, students, parents, and teachers have worked with custodial staff to design and build better playgrounds, to plant trees, and to design and paint murals. Great improvements can be made with little cost by holding a fall and spring "work day," when students and staff paint lockers and walls, clear up the grounds, plant trees, construct playground equipment, and so forth.

- The number and type of rules. A few, clearly stated, rules that do not suggest unlimited control over all facets of behavior, but instead are opportunities to learn and engage in responsible membership in a community, are best. Some schools have functioned smoothly with three basic rules:

- -- come to school and attend class
  -- work (try to learn something every day)
  -- respect the rights, dignity, welfare, and material goods of others.

Independent Alternative Schools

The advantages of a small school "community" and the advantages of a large school facility have been combined by schools that have organized administration, teaching, curriculum, and physical space, around a set of small schools-within-schools. Working with students, parents, teachers, and administrators ensures that the design of schools-within-schools reflects current interests and needs. Each small "school" may vary not only in

its curriculum but also in the style of interaction between teacher and students, the mode of instruction, type of materials, rules for behavior, and so forth. Participation in one of the schools is by choice, both for students and teachers.

Chapter III

SORTING OUT THE OPTIONS

Making things better should not require charisma, extraordinary self-discipline, or the strength of ten in the face of adversity. The discussions that follow fall into three general areas, and parallel three general stages of introducing new approaches in classrooms, schools or entire districts.

The first stage is simply getting started. Getting started requires concerted attention to the local setting and the consolidation of intent to do something. It includes these activities:

- Stirring up interest and energy among teachers, students, administrators, school board members and the like.
- Recruiting a core group of people which is sufficietnly small to be manageable and cohesive, sufficiently large to divide up the preparatory work and to be taken seriously, and sufficiently diverse to account for varied interests, perspectives, and influences.
- Generating support at all levels of school structure and from active, vocal, and organized influences in the community.
- Assessing the present situation, building a detailed picture of present strengths and weaknesses, satisfactions and problems, resources and constraints.
- Adopting a set of criteria by which you decide whether a program is both educationally desirable and organizationally feasible.
- Proposing a set of possible approaches by using a combination of brainstorming, reading, visits to other schools and conversations with other principals, teachers, and students.
- Selecting an approach and designing a program.
- Preparing a plan that states what is to be tried, by whom, with what resources, over what period of time, with what expected results.

The second stage is implementation. It calls for:

- A program of regular inservice training, designed and managed locally and tied to the practical problems of people who are trying to make the program work.
- Regular staff meetings organized around substantive issues. The original program design and plan should form the starting point for discussion, at least as something from which to deviate.

- Continued development of support from the school board (which may control formal policy), the central administration (which controls resources), building staff (which controls day to day practice), parents and community groups or organizations (which can control the outlook of principals, administration and school board), and students (who control relatively little but whose participation -- enthusiastic or grudging -- can influence program outcomes).

- Enough time to give a program a serious try.

- Evaluation that is tied to the original assumptions about what must be changed and that charts the process of implementation as well as the individual and organizational effects.

This stage is marked by:

- Gradual emergence of intended effects: increase in achievement and attendance and reduction in truancy, dropout rate, and disruption.

- Incorporating the program as a regular part of instructional and central operating budget (i.e., removing special project status), policy and personnel arrangements.

Getting Started

The first stage of work is organized around two related activities:

- Sorting out ideas, which calls for assessing the present situation, identifying and defining present problems, and offering proposals for change.

- Generating support for doing something different.

Board participation in the definition of a problem and the design of a solution will provide a base of support from a range of persons and groups who, through their joint work, come to have relatively clear idea of what is intended and how it will be tried out.

Prospects for improvement are enhanced by treating as resources all of the people and groups who spend their days at school. Effort will be required to recruit those groups that are never asked to participate and for whom an invitation will be treated as token. A mechanism must be developed and sustained so that these people are taken seriously and are able to develop competence in the examination of problems, the consideration of a variety of perspectives for viewing those problems, and the design for workable and provable solutions.

What Kinds of Participation?

The specific forms of participation that are offered must be tied to the work that needs to be done, the specific capabilities of people or groups to help out, the interest in gaining support without overextending abilities or taxing good will, and the opportunities offered. Several possibilities are apparent:

- Participation can be limited to occasional review and comment, including presence at formal meetings, invitation to review proposals, periodic phone calls, and the like.

- Participation can be expressed by membership in a community or on a task force, regardless of the actual work undertaken or influence exerted.

- Participation can take the form of spreading the good word, formally through speeches and informally through casual conversations.

- Participation can take the form of research into the nature and extent of the problem and approaches to solution.

- Participation can require joint work to develop proposals and plans for a solution, based on all available information and taking into account the variety of interests at stake.

The reason for inviting participation from several diverse interests will in large part determine the form the participation takes. There can be several purposes:

1) To enhance the stake that all people have in making the school a good place to be. People will have a greater stake in doing well when they have some influence over what is happening. Participation amounts to shared responsibility for making the school a good place to teach and learn.

2) To increase the odds of acting wisely. The field of delinquency prevention and the process of educational change and improvement are sufficiently ambiguous and uncertain that all resources should be used in considering the problem and posing solutions.

3) To build a group of knowledgeable allies. A formal committee or an informal association can lend credibility and legitimacy to these pursuits and can serve as a reference group whose members support each other.

4) To avoid claims of exclusiveness (railroading) and to accomodate known sources of oppositions. A diverse group is likely to represent the array of local perspectives on a problem and to offer a more realistic view of the odds of support of specific program options. Also, interaction among diverse groups will produce a plan that more people can live with.

5) To get started on the problem. The participation of several interested parties in defining the problem, describing the problem with sufficient detail to support proposed action, and designing an intervention is visible action which may have its own independent effect on the problems at hand.

6) To comply with requirements. Legislative or administrative requirements must be taken into account in the preparation of any program.

Assess the Present Situation

The signs of trouble in school -- increasing rates of truancy, dropouts, disruptions, violence, disinterest, alienation, vandalism and failure -- may stand as descriptions of a problem. However, precipitous action to jump in an "model program" as a response to difficulties generally leads to later disappointment and discouragement. Even the most thoroughly developed and pre-packaged model must be adapted to suit local conditions and requirements. A "need assessment," should be done and comprised of a combination of methods -- anything from books to conversations to surveys -- all intended to shed some light on the local situation. All observations, suggestions, complaints, official records and statistics are treated as data on the problem. Sorting out the data, treating data as evidence and assigning weight and significance to them will have to be handled locally as part of the chores of the group or task force. Answer the following sorts of questions:

- What are the prevailing views of the situation held by teachers, students, parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and others?

- For whom are these matters a problem, and how is the problem described? What causes are offered and what solutions, if any, are posed?

- By what mechanisms -- policy, rules, budget -- are these views made powerful or powerless?

- What is the magnitude of these problems? How many students are dropping out, and under what circumstances? How many students are cutting classes and entire school days? How many reports of vandalism have there been and what is the dollar loss?

- How serious are these issues? What sort of space do these problems or issues take up in school? Are they frequent topics of conversation? Is the school generally a pleasant place to be, where failure and disruption affect only a very few students or teachers? Is the school a difficult place to be, where the official statistics of truancy, vandalism, and the rest are simply the most visible in a range of problems?

- Who are the students or teachers with problems? Are the students who stay away from school, who eventually drop out, the same ones who experience perpetual failure? Is there any one group which is overrepresented in the problem statistics?

- What specific acts or interactions are behind the general statistics? What are the acts by which students can get into trouble in this school? Are they in practice the same acts for everyone? What do teachers mean when they say students are disrespectful, defiant, mean, unprepared, lazy, hostile, or insolent? When and where and under what circumstances do students act in these ways? What specific acts show that students are bored, turned off, put down, hassled?

- What is being tried now in this school to control truancy, drop-out rates, disruption, failure and alienation? What approaches have been tried in individual classrooms? What have other schools tried, under what circumstances and with what success?

Other questions will arise in the course of the inquiry; new issues will be discovered and new aspects of the situation will be revealed. Some additional advice:

- This stage is for collecting data, not ammunition.

- Exploration is not an excuse for proselytizing.

- People may attribute blame or credit to individuals. Do not gossip about others and do not permit the exploration activity generally to become a vehicle for spreading gossip.

- Most participants have a point of view by the time they enter into "exploration" work. For purposes of exploring and assessing the situation, it will be best to act as if you do not.

- Do not polarize the issue by visibly taking sides.

- Do not provoke people into asking for promises, do not make commitments, and do not require commitments from others. If you encounter people who want to participate, tell them how. Do not question their motives.

All of these steps are part of a preliminary assessment that substitutes specific knowledge for generalized suspicions, rumors, complaints, and fears.

Any activity which will have large and important consequences for people is likely to bring forth groups which claim to have the right to influence the issue. The closer the program comes to touching upon central and widely shared interests, the more political it will be. Some issues will appear more political than others because they touch upon broader and more visible interests. In any political venture, you should not assume that

people who hold opposing viewpoints -- teachers, parents, school board members, juvenile court judges, or whoever -- harbor bad intentions. In the absence of shared agreement on direction and substance, it is wise to assume shared good intentions.

Design a Program

Program design, and the plan for putting it into effect, will reflect decisions about each of the goals listed below. There should be no secret intents and no secret plans. The program design should state clearly the set of assumptions guiding the work and the set of activities or strategies to be used to reach the desired results.

- The design should include a rationale or justification. The rationale should make a specific argument that what you are about to change bears a direct and immediate relation to such problems as school failure, disruption, dropout rate, or truancy.

- The design should specify the way that program operations are tied to the rationale. An alternative program should reflect the following design principles:

  -- Inclusion, or recruiting and preserving a mix of students so that the program is not viewed as only for troublemakers and does not reduce the chances for the student to succeed. A wary eye should be kept on eligibility criteria.

  -- Choice as a basis for participation by teachers, students, and parents.

  -- Structuring the grounds for participation, the set of activities, the arrangements for credit, and so forth of increase the odds that the program will be seen as legitimate and valuable by all.

  -- Design and selection of activities to increase the competence of all participants and to broaden the range of things which people can do, can do well, and can use to demonstrate their worth to themselves and others.

This all amounts to having an idea based on evidence, organizing practice as a stringent and deliberate response to the idea, and checking carefully to see how you have done.

Specific Requirements

Before a program can be put into practice, you should consider each of the following matters:

- How is credit to be awarded? For what range of activities can students accrue credit, and in what increments? What is the standard for good work?

- How is student progress to be evaluated and conveyed? Will there be an option for traditional grades, for pass/failure, for written evaluations or teacher-student conferences? Will failure grades be used?

- How is the program to be governed? Who participates in decisions about hiring or promotion, curriculum design, budget design, materials development, rules and regulations? What role will the principal, teachers, students, and parents play?

- How will students be recruited or referred into the program?

- What will the curriculum look like? What is available for study and what is required?

- Is there a particular set of educational methods to be tried? Will teachers be expected to attempt new ways of teaching to interacting with students? What weight is given to work-study arrangements, experimentation, lectures, etc.?

- What role will volunteers play?

- What will be the attendance policy?

- What rules and regulations will govern student and teacher behavior?

- What provision is there for review of program design and operation during implementation?

- What are the budget priorities? How should resources -- money, physical space, staff, materials -- be allocated in light of the program's intent? While there may be some one-time start-up costs, the cost projected for the program should be no more than the cost of the conventional or traditional arrangements.

- What are the intended relations with other classrooms or schools? With other community organizations or groups?

- What kinds of records will be kept for students, teachers, the school as a whole?

- How will testing be handled?

- How large or comprehensive will the program be? How can it make the most effective use of resources and still be large enough to be taken seriously and to permit demonstrable effects to emerge and be noticed?

- How ambitious should the program be? Promises of great achievements often lead to disappointment, yet programs that aim for too little may not spark the enthusiasm or challenge the talents of teachers or students.

- What arrangements will be made for inservice training?

- Are expectations for teachers reflected in job descriptions? How clear are the expectations for what teachers will do? What provision is made for modifying expectations as opportunities and constraints become clearer?

- What facilities will you use? Does the program require any change in the present use of space? Are there building and safety code provisions to take into account?

- What are the staff qualifications? Will you use only certified teachers? What low cost arrangements can be made for reducing the adult/youth ratio? What roles will non-certified staff or volunteers play?

- What legislative requirements or local policies affect your plans? Are waivers needed for anything? What will be the reporting requirements?

- What will be the course of study? Will the curriculum be basically the same as in the traditional classroom, with changes primarily in mode of presentation? What standards of academic progress will be maintained?

The two sections that follow illustrate some of the issues at stake in managing two of these design issues: selecting participants (students and teachers) and money.

Selecting the Participants

Student Participation: Mixing the participants. If any activity involves only youth described as maladjusted, incompetent, troublesome, or delinquent, the activity is likely to be similarly described. A conservative rule, given the inevitable pressure to fill a program with "troubled" kids, is to insure that youths with negative labels constitute no more than half the participants. Observing this principle can require careful attention, given the program opportunities and the different types of labels a young person can acquire. Mixing participants is necessary in program design if positive intent is to be preserved.

Selecting and recruiting students. There are two ways to get into a program. You can be sent there or you can choose to sign up. The first case is usually called referral, where students are placed in a program as a consequence of some decision over which they have no influence. A student may be referred on the basis of a diagnosis of some kind, or because of a rule or regulation requiring particular treatments, services, or punishments as a consequence of some action. The bulk of program placements in schools are referrals of the first sort.

In "positive" programs, students are not directed to participate. Rather, they are recruited on the merits of the program, the credibility of the invitation, and the interests of the young persons involved. The basis of the recruitment is specific information about a program. Teachers, other school personnel, and students who have credibility are natural choices for recruiters. To start, the program should include a mix of all sorts of youth, so that recruitment begins simply by advertising the program in a conventional way. A conventional way is to list the program with other courses and provide information about it when students enroll for courses. Some advance advertising probably would not hurt. This procedures avoids labeling the program or the youths involved. Students all apply for the program in the same way. If there are too many applicants, a lottery will preserve the mix fairly.

Teacher Participation. A common and mistaken view is that teachers who take on the disinterested, alienated, disruptive, unsuccessful students must be young, creative, politically liberal, and willing to work an eighty-hour week. However, teachers' personalities or general teaching styles should not be selection criteria.

Teachers' expectations are directly and powerfully related to student achievement. Students are most likely to do well when the teacher has and demonstrates an unshakable conviction that the student can and will learn. Further, specific forms of teacher/student interaction have a bearing on failure and disruption. Sarcasm from a teacher is particularly powerful in producing disruptive behavior.

The strongest grounds for teacher selection are:

- Choice: The teacher selects the program and is not arbitrarily assigned to it.

- Interest: The teacher finds the program a challenge, is interested in trying it, is confident in his or her own ability to manage new or difficult situations, and is confident in his or her ability to teach even the most unsuccessful student.

- Expectations for students: The teacher believes that even the most difficult or unsuccessful student can and will learn.

- Interaction with students: The verbal skill and authority of the teacher are used as resources, not weapons. When direct observation is not possible, judgements may be made on the basis of the number of referrals the teacher typically makes to the dean or principal.

One warning: The decision to select one teacher over another should not be made on the basis of their respective knowledge of the language and logic of alternative education. A teacher may be sold on the latest ideas and experiments in alternative education but not be able to implement these ideas or may alienate less convinced colleagues and administrators.

How can teachers decide if they are interested? Lay out reasonable grounds on which they can decide whether or not to apply by presenting information about 1.) what you intend, 2.) why, 3.) how it will be reflected in the design of the program, 4.) what teachers are expected to do in the classroom, in school or program governance, in working with parents or aides, 5.) selecting or designing materials, and 6.) constructing or reconstructing curriculum. Reluctance to try something new may be traced to the fear that expectations for performance may outstrip one's capabilities to perform, or that one will be asked to promise more than can be delivered.

Volunteers. Take volunteers seriously. Design their roles with the same care that you would design a paid staff position, and expect that they will act the same way that staff do. Require commitments for time and participation, getting rid of volunteers who do not take the commitment seriously. Volunteers must enable you to expand the quantity and quality of expertise available and must make the operation more, not less, routine and predictable.

Money

Most of the suggestions in this report can be managed with little money and with little or no supplemental assistance. Further, reliance on local resources forces a key issue: What are people willing to pay to make a difference? If truancy is a problem, what investment is reasonable to solve it? And how much of a change makes this expenditure worth it?

With scarce federal funding and state funding frequently tied to categorical programs for specific "target populations," local alternative schools have turned to sources close to home to support their efforts. Here is some advice on funding problems:

- Consider your program strategy in light of future budget requirements. Are you starting a program that has few prospects for continuing because of its projected costs? In some cities the school district manages the funding for a range of alternative schools by splitting its available funds across a number of types of schools; alternatives are a part of the standard operation, rather than an appendage supported temporarily by federal or state funds.

- Independent, separate alternative schools should concentrate their search for local and state funds, looking for relatively small amounts of money from each of several sponsors. Local service clubs might sponsor an internship or student volunteer component; the public schools may fund tutorial and remedial work; local unions or foundations supply funds for a youth employment component.

- Anticipate future requirements for funds and lay groundwork routinely and continuously. This calls for developing a reputation as a program worth supporting and requires the same techniques for generating support that you will use to get started in the first place. Spread good news through casual conversations with school board members, city council representatives, local business people; seek help from school colleagues and from other agencies or groups to improve the program and do it on a regular, routine basis; use the media to highlight accomplishments; make periodic reports to persons or groups whose support is critical.

- Use imagination to generate resources from unlikely sources. Look for opportunities for in-kind exchanges, for joint ventures with other programs or schools, or for collective lobbying or funding possibilities.

- Anticipate recurrent objections or questions and prepare responses to them. Do not lie, do not make exaggerated claims of success, and do not make promises you cannot keep.

Make a plan

Without a plan your achievements may be tenuous, and a matter of luck. As a point of departure, consider the desired results: what are you aiming for? Consider what you would like to have in place by the end of one year. Work backwards from there through the inventory of tasks to be managed. Arrange them as specific steps with agreements about who is to do what, and by what time.

The plan is a document written in sand. The unanticipated and expected will arise; the surprise windfall will come your way or a critical agreement will fall through. Then the plan will change, but the original intent must be kept.

Making It Happen: Implementation

Here are some ways to make translating an idea into practice controllable and definite.

- Make orientation training sessions a routine part of hiring and student selection procedures so that principal participants start out with a relatively clear view about what is intended and why things are designed the way they are.

- Job descriptions for staff should be realistic and clear, and should be revised as discoveries are made which force shifts in expectations.

- Maintain a plan that is real, is in the hands of participants, declares intents known to and shared by all, and serves as the point of departure for regular, seminar-type meetings.

- Maintain a schedule of regular occasions for reflection (staff meetings, seminar etc.). If the school or program develops a poor reputation with the neighbors, then it should be given some attention. If teachers are frustrated and angry at the number and range of demands being placed on them, then re-organization may be due, or some efforts to clarify what participation amounts to in the program. These are not encounter groups or sensitivity sessions but meetings to give attention to specific issues.

- Establish working relations and agreements with knowledgeable allies outside the program, e.g., in a local college or university or in the central administration. Such arrangements offer the opportunity for outside resources to be sought when problems cannot be sorted out or solved internally and offer technical assistance resources that are too expensive or infrequently required to be assigned to program staff.

- Arrange for regular, extended, inservice training tied to practical problems and aimed at generating specific strategies to try out. Pre-implementation training or orientation sessions serve a different purpose, and cannot be used to anticipate in advance all of the difficulties people will have and all of the insights they will accumulate. Inservice training is the frequent opportunity for everybody to become clearer about what they should be doing and to be better at it. Regular training sessions also create an occasion for members of the group to exchange observations, offer advice, brainstorm solutions to recurrent problems, or to congratulate each other on successes.

- Arrange for needed program resources. If it requires special materials, special arrangements for off-campus study or work, special arrangements for transportation, support from a roving teacher and the like, the program should not be started until such materials are available and such arrangements have been made.

- Make the program compatible with other organizational requirements. To what extent will participation in this program place people in jeopardy with other organizational policies and practices? For instance, resentment from nonparticipating teachers can be created by exempting participants' from rules for class attendance. If rules are going to be bent for a particular program, it is worth considering their purpose in the first place for the entire school.

- Aim for substantial, improvement results. Challenge teachers and students. This amounts to securing an agreement to give the idea a serious try for some specified period of time. It is not necessary that all members of the school agree, but that some "critical mass" of persons finds the idea persuasive and agrees to try it out.

- Seek a good image among school personnel, students and the community by:

  -- Paying attention to what the program is called. Names can create resistance which has nothing to do with the program. A drug rehabilitation program in Massachusetts was doomed before it ever opened its doors when it chose the acronym ACID.

  -- Arranging for a sponsor with credibility and legitimacy.

  -- Preserving a mix of participants, so that the program does not become known as "that element."

  -- Designing a program which is attractive and will attract participants on the merits of its ideas and its approaches. Recruitment should be avid and broad enough to insure that students who are having trouble feel invited.

  -- Staffing the program with people who are admired and supported outside the program.

  -- Paying attention to the physical location and appearance of the program.

  -- Creating visible and frequent opportunities for program participants to demonstrate competence and worth.

- Seek support and active involvement of school principals. The principal sets the tone for the school, and offers legitimacy to experimental efforts.

- Give some precision to coordination. If coordination with other agencies is called for, e.g., by legislation, give careful thought to the form of that relationship. In what ways should organizations regularly and systematically take each other into account and cultivate interdependence? To what extent should they remain independent of each other? Are the interests of the program enhanced by periodic reporting? Informal sharing of information? A simple letter of shared intent? Representation on an advisory board or case review board? In-kind exchange of staff services? Reciprocal rights to files and records? Joint planning for the way two or more groups to pursue the same set of goals? Joint proposals? At what level in the organization is joint business handled most productively? All of these questions must be taken up within the context of specific local programs. Coordination can be handled at any or all of the following levels:

  -- Administrative -- joint budgeting, joint funding, centralized personnel administration, exchange or joint use of staff, one agency contracting for another's services.

-- Joint support services -- recordkeeping, purchasing, grants management, technical assistance.

-- Joint handling of client recruitment, diagnosis, referral, follow-up, and case coordination.

- Make use of community resources in two ways: by going out of the school and by bringing new resources into the school. The most extensive effort to go out of the school building is represented by "schools without walls," where classroom activity takes place throughout a community, in banks, factories, hospitals, museums, city halls, and courtrooms. Work-study arrangements, internships and volunteer programs (for credit, and tied to class work) are other examples. Some schools bring the community into the school by asking architects, bankers, lawyers, doctors, contractors, and the like to teach minicourses in the school.

- Design an evaluation that you can understand and develop a working agreement for feedback regularly enough to contribute to inservice training sessions. Arrange for the evaluators to join the staff, students, parents and administrators in seminars and planning sessions where the practical implications of findings can be examined and plans made.

Inservice Training

Inservice training is most useful when it makes intent and practice more clear, persistence more rewarding, and the support of others more assured. Some observations:

- Inservice training is an opportunity for interaction and to build cooperative relationships around a specific substantive issue. Through inservice training, a set of circumstances can be presented about truancy, failure, and the rest supported by reflection, study and discussion of collective efforts at sorting out and trying interventions, testing good ideas, and opening up classroom and schoolwide efforts to systematic scrutiny.

- The form of inservice training -- that is, the type of help or interaction most useful -- depends on what stage things are in and how it is going. An inspirational lecture from a respected authority may be the most appropriate contribution when a problem is first recognized. In later stages, any one or more of the following arrangements might lend clarity or just plain energy to a difficult situation:

  -- Opportunities to visit other schools that are trying a similar program.

  -- Demonstration teaching in the classroom to watch someone else employ techniques and translate theory into practice.

-- Classroom observation. Teachers have sometimes been able to try out new practices in the classroom with the supportive presence of the inservice consultant in the back of the room.

-- Seminars. Seminars offer a place away from the school in which to reflect on how it is going, to trade practical advice and observations or books with fellow teachers, and so on.

-- Role playing outside the classroom. Trying out techniques in familiar but simulated situations offers the chance to practice without the high stakes presented in an actual classroom situation.

-- Sharing the written word. The volume of written material on alternative education and educational innovation is expanding by leaps and bounds. As an inservice function, the school district or local university can agree to pass on a list of new references on a quarterly or semi-annual basis.

- The place where inservice training makes a difference is in the course of ordinary school work. An inexpensive inservice training program can be organized around a core of interested teachers working in the same school or in school within a close geographic area and who are willing to spend time in a seminar at least twice a month, and who can operate as teams within the school.

- Teachers represent a tremendous and largely untapped resource for inservice training. An extensive inservice program can be organized around the potential for teachers to learn from each other, with the major cost being the transportation from one school to another.

Where Did We Go Wrong?

Assuming an adequate rationale and a sound design, what can kill a program?

- The absence of a group of administrators, teachers, and students who support it and who give it sufficient time and space in the school or the community to be taken seriously.

- Insufficient time for effects to emerge and insufficient opportunity to make use of developments and discoveries. Some effects can be sought in very short time, but gradual and continuous reconstruction of a school is likely to require three or four years.

- Expectations for clarity (what to do Monday) and efficacy (what will work, and how soon) are generally too great, especially at the beginning. Do not guarantee the effects of attempted reforms, or estimate the time it will take for difficulties in program design to be ironed out, or designate a specific time when benefits will be apparent. Local arrangements which support continuous effort are preferable to those which force success within a very limited time frame.

- Stigma, or a poor image. Programs which are exclusively for students who are the least admired, least valued members of the school community attract considerable resentment, contempt, or disdain from other students and teachers, and from budget-conscious members of the community.

- Dependency on outside consultants and prepackaged management approaches. The most consistent support, most relevant and timely advice, and greatest range of resources are in the local schools and community.

Summary

This section has been concerned with turning ideas into practice. Distilled into a single list, here are some of the major points:

- Assess the local situation carefully and completely before jumping to solutions or the adoption of model programs. Put your assessment -- definitions of problems, present conditions, existing resources -- on paper.

- Seek support and participation from a range of interested persons, particularly those strategically situated (in the school system and the community) to help or hinder your efforts. Do not try to exclude people or organizations because they disagreee.

- Make your aspirations and your assumptions clear: have a rationale for what you are doing and why.

- Propose program approaches that take into account both what is educationally desirable (a sound idea) and organizationally feasible (we can do it here).

- Seek ideas and experiences from others, but draw on your own talents and your own knowledge and experience.

- Visit other schools faced with similar circumstances.

- Design an approach that takes into account each of the following elements.

  -- What is to be changed? Overall school climate? Specific teaching practices? Ways of managing conflicts? Specific skills? Student attitudes and behavior? All of the above?

  -- What scale effort will be mounted? Districtwide? Schoolwide? A few classrooms? Specific students? Specific teachers?

  -- Who will be in charge? How is the program (or school) to be governed? Who has a say in making rules and regulations, designing budget, hiring staff, designing curriculum, and so forth?

-- How will students be recruited to participate, or referred for participation?

-- How will teachers be recruited?

-- How will job descriptions be prepared and revised?

-- What will be the curriculum?

-- What materials will be used or prepared?

-- What physical space will be required?

-- What will the program be called?

-- How will student progress and teacher performance be evaluated?

-- How will program effectiveness be judged?

-- What use will be made of other adults, e.g., volunteers and uncertified staff?

-- What will be the attendance policy?

-- What will be the program (or school) rules and regulations?

-- How much money and other resources will be needed?

-- What will be the relations with other classrooms, schools, and the community?

-- How will testing be managed?

-- How will the program be compatible (or incompatible) with other school policies, programs, and habitual practices?

-- What provisions will be made for inservice training? What other arrangements will support morale, consolidate interest and intent, etc.?

- Make a plan that sorts out the specific steps that must be taken. Prepare a schedule and exact commitments from people.

- Use a notice board or printed bulletin to handle trivial or routine business so that group meeting times are not taken up in that way.

- Use your plan as a point of departure in regular meetings (staff meetings, seminars, participant gatherings, or whatever). The meetings should have an agenda, should be organized around substantive issues, and should not be taken up with business trivia.

- Make limited use of outside consultants. Aim for local achievements, with local resources, local momentum, local incentive, and local considerations. If you use an outside consultant, pay attention to the consultant's strategic role at a particular point in your plan, have in mind a specific contribution to be made, and anticipate how to pick up where the consultant leaves off.

- Develop a working agreement -- a sort of partnership -- with local colleges or universities to do some of the work (e.g., keeping current with research, legislation, new ideas, and new practices) that individual schools or teachers have neither the time nor the resources for. In exchange, schools can offer limited access to the school for study by university faculty or graduate students.

- Organize a program of inservice training that offers opportunities for participating teachers to meet at least twice a month.

- Seek local funds, and plan a program that, once started, will cost no more than the regular school program to maintain. Use supplemental funds (state, federal, or foundation) for start-up or one-time costs.

- Evaluate how the program works, using both formal measures and informal means of "checking out how it's going."

- Seek agreements to try out the approach for at least two years If you have a good idea, two years is not too long to give it a serious try.

- Continue generating support for and curiosity about the program after it is underway. Aim at losing special project status and becoming incorporated into the habits, outlooks, policies, and budget of the district.

APPENDIX A: SOURCES OF INFORMATION

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

ORGANIZATIONS

There are several organizations which focus specifically on alternative education or on educational change more broadly. As questions emerge, they should be considered as principal resources. They are:

The Center for Options in Public Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

The Center for New Schools
59 East Van Buren
Chicago, Illinois 60605

The National Alternative Schools Program
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Institute for the Development of Educational Activities
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California
(contact John Goodlad, Dean of Education, UCLA)

CADRE, College of Education
600 S. College
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104

Institute for Responsive Education
704 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
(617) 353-3309

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Youth programs of a variety of sorts are administered by agencies throughout the Federal government; not all of those programs are covered here. Some sources for further information are:

Mr. Robert Taggart, Administrator
Office of Youth Programs
Employment and Training Administration
Department of Labor
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20213
(202) 376-6819

Mr. John Rector, Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531
(202) 376-3548

Mr. Larry Dye, Commissioner
Youth Development Bureau
Office of Human Development Services
Department of Health Education, and Welfare
Room 3268, North Building
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-2870

Mr. Thomas Burns, Associate Commissioner
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2079-D
Federal Office Building 6
Washington, D.C. 20202

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

The following legislation is administered by D/HEW, and is relevant to one or more aspects of the issues addressed in this manual:

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Title IV of ESEA offers the broadest opportunities for educational innovations directed at increasing achievement, preventing dropout, strengthening instruction and other school services, obtaining materials and so forth. Funds are allocated in accordance with a state plan. Part C provides for a competitive grant program managed by the state Department of Education (in line with state plan priorities) and focused on innovation.

Emergency School Assistance Act

Under this legislation, grants may be awarded to districts to manage the transition to (court-ordered) desegregation. A program of Special Student Concerns (including issues surrounding suspension) includes grants made to public agencies other than schools. For more information contact:

Dr. Herman Goldberg, Associate Commissioner
for Equal Opportunity Programs
Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-8484

Mrs. Dorothea Perkins, Director
Office of Special Student Concerns
Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-2465

Civil Rights Act, Title IV

This title supports the transition to desegration through grants to state agencies and to university desegregation centers. University centers are funded in part to provide training and technical assistance to local districts. A particular concern in 1978 has been discipline and suspension.

Teacher Corps

Teacher Corps programs emphasize collaboration among universities, local schools and community groups and organizations to strengthen teaching practices (primarily directed at children of poor families). A recent program, funded with Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act money, has centered on the reduction of school crime through student-initiated activities. These programs are described in a Teacher Corps publication, Student-Initiated Activities:

A similar advocacy project begun in 1969, is aimed at those students who are re-entering school from a correctional institution. For further information, contact:

Dr. William Smith, Director
Teacher Corps
Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-8292

Community School Program

Under this program, funds are spent to develop schools as centers of community activity (along the lines of the Mott-funded community schools started in Michigan), and to support training and technical assistance by state agencies and universities. For more information, contact:

Mr. Ron Castaldi
Community School Program
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education
Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-0691

The program ideas sponsored through these sources, and the experiences reported, may be of more use to local schools and districts than the funds made available. In several cases (e.g., Teacher Corps), funds have been granted to a small number of districts to develop and demonstrate particular approaches to the reduction of school crime, the improvement of educational practice, the transition to desegrated schools and the like. Legislation that affects funding of school districts throughout a state, such as ESEA, may offer the best oppurtunity for supplemental funding.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

This agency administers, through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. One of the principal concerns of this legislation is delinquency prevention through the improvement of school programs. Educational programs can be supported in two ways:

1. Through the formula grants allocation to states. For information about program support in Florida, contact:

   Richard Dolan, Juvenile Justice Specialist
   Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance
   530 Carlton Building
   Tallahassee, Florida 32304

2. Through special emphasis initiative in alternative education to be announced in December, 1978. For information, contact:

   Ms. Emily Martin
   Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
   Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
   633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20531
   (202)724-7751

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

This agency administers legislation that provides money to support public employment (e.g., to pay for adult aides in schools), and that provides opportunities for young people to gain work experience while they remain in school.

Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA)

CETA is a source of supplemental funds to expand the number and range of adults in schools. Funds are allocated by "prime sponsors" (cities of 10,000 or more) or by an agency of state government ("remainder of state," covering smaller cities and rural areas). For information, contact your local government.

Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act

This is actually a 1977 amendment to the Comprehensive Employment Training Act. There are four major programs involved, Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects and relatively large scale demonstration projects in a few cities, with one aspect of the demonstration built around partnerships between a CETA prime sponsor and a local school system. Local districts may want to keep track of the experience generated by these projects, but they are not a generally accessible source of funds. The most promising of the four programs as a source for local school programs is the Youth Employment and Training Programs component. Prime sponsors will divide over $400 million, with twenty-two percent reserved specifically for inschool projects.

APPENDIX B: REFERENCES

SUGGESTED REFERENCES ON MANAGING CHANGES

Arnove, Robert and Toby Strout. "Alternative Schools for Disruptive Youth." 1978. A paper prepared for the National Institute of Education/ Educational Equity Group-School Social Relations. (September).

This paper analyzes the uses and misuses of alternative education programs designed specifically for disruptive youth. The authors base their analysis on a review of current research, observation of operating programs and extensive interviews with program staff in Boston, Philadelphia, Houston, Chicago, Grand Rapids, Louisville, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Los Angeles, San Jose, Berkeley and Seattle. Positive effects of the programs include gains in basic academic and social skills, improved self-concept and increased approval from others; such effects were traced in part to small adult/student ratios, individualized instruction, warm interpersonal relationships between teachers and students, special counseling support, and an attempt to tie academic work to work requirements and opportunities. Negative aspects included the negative labeling (stigmatization) of students in the program, the disproportionate number of minority students (with the attendant danger of racial isolation), academic tracking which results from a limited curriculum, and the lack of choice and tight social control which characterize some programs. In addition, the authors note that most districts place the bulk of resources for alternatives in secondary schools, where problems seem most severe, when lower cost intervention in elementary schools might have greater payoff.

Berman, Paul and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Prepared for the U.S. Office of Education, DHEW. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. 1978.

This is the summary report of a four year study of educational innovations and the conditions under which they are successfully implemented and sustained in schools. Some principal findings include:

1. Successful implementation is not a matter of cost. Some of the most expensive innovations were abandoned when federal seed money ran out; some of the least expensive programs resulted in change in student outcomes and teacher behavior. Expensive programs were no more likely to be implemented and continued than inexpensive programs.

2. Successful implementation is not tied to the worth of the idea or practice, but to the organizational conditions under which the idea is tried out. Conditions which supported implementation included: ongoing, concrete training for teachers, tied to emerging practical problems; broad based support from both central administration and building staff; opportunities to observe similar efforts in other classrooms or schools; regular meetings of participants to discuss practical problems; local materials development; and the active participation of the principal in training and in building support. Ineffective implementation was often characterized by: reliance on outside consultants who had no day-by-day familarity with the effort; packaged management approaches; one-shot, preimplementation training; a premature attempt to be comprehensive (spreading resources too thin at the start); goals that were trivial or not sufficiently challenging.

Burges, Bill. Facts for a Change: Citizen Action Research for Better Schools. Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education. 1976.

Although directed specifically at a citizen audience, this book could be extended or modified to fit the circumstances in which any group unfamiliar with the vagaries of research can employ research techniques to help approach a practical problem. The book should be useful for students, citizens, teachers, and others who want to have a hand in defining a problem and posing a solution.

"Citizen Action in Education." Quarterly Journal of the Institute for Responsive Education, Boston, Massachusetts.

This journal addresses itself specifically to the ways in which citizens can take part in efforts to improve schools generally and to tackle specific problems such as dropout, vandalism and violence, and declining achievement. The Institute for Responsive Education also publishes a series of small paperback books on various aspects of citizen influence on educational change, including techniques of action research.

Fader, Daniel. The Naked Children. New York: Bantam Books. 1971.

We add this book to the list by way of reaffirming our principle that solutions must be cast within the reach of ordinary circumstances to be valid, and to confirm the reader's impression that it probably won't be easy. Fader's effort was not easy, and it was not entirely successful. There were some steps that could have been taken (in the luxury of hindsight) to make it a better try, including some way (e.g., in special seminars) to consolidate the program's supporters into an effective group.

Fantini, Mario. Alternative Education: A Source Book for Parents, Teachers, Students, and Administrators. New York: Doubleday. Section VII, "Financing Alternative Schools."

In this section of Fantini's useful sourcebook are arguments specifically on the funding of alternative schools, including a description of costs typically incurred, the calculation of per-pupil equivalencies, the development of proposals, and the potential use of vouchers to expand and support alternatives.

Goodlad, John I. The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools. New York: McGraw Hill. 1975.

Goodlad reports in a clear style, in good humor, in careful detail, and with insight of many years' experience and reflection the experimental partnership of UCLA, IDEA (a subsidiary of the Kettering Foundation), and eighteen elementary schools to "improve educational practice." Unlike most similar "helping" arrangements between local schools and universities, this arrangement was not fostered to sell a particular innovation. The participating schools contributed a loose and unspecified interest in making things better; Goodlad and his associates offered the resources of UCLA to help principals and

teachers learn to sort out directions to pursue and strategies for doing so--the most important contributions may have been the persistent refusal to supply "the answer" and the consistent moral support to keep at it. In the course of the experiment, principals and teachers formed cross-school peer reference groups as a source of ideas and strength.

Further discussions of funding sources and tactics for generating funds may be found in:

Grantsmanship Center News. The Grantsmanship Center, 1015 West Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90015. ($15/yr. for six issues.)

This is a well-written, detailed publication covering a wide range of circumstances, sources, and tactics for funding. Through this one periodical you will find your way to most of the other major sources, including the Foundation Directory and other sources on public and private support.

Gross, Neal, Joseph B. Giacquinta, and Marilyn Bernstein. Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books. 1971.

Gross and his associates spent eight months studying the fate of a school-wide innovation which was imposed on elementary school teachers early in the school year by decision of the principal. Teachers accepted the plausibility of the innovation at the start ("teacher as catalyst" idea using open classrooms and team teaching) but were uncertain how to go about doing it and were left generally without administrative follow-up (or backup), without inservice training to ease the transition, and even without the promised materials and supplies. By late spring, teachers were frustrated and angry, administrators were threatening sanctions against teachers who did not do well, and the initiator of the innovation was assigning blame to the teachers for not being able to take a good idea and make something of it.

Holt, John. What Do I Do Monday? New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, Inc. 1970.

Holt places change and improvement within the reach of ordinary teachers and students by posing tactics which can be entertained and pursued within the existing arrangements, or with relatively modest changes. While never letting go of a vision of what schools could be, he offers practical advice on the presentation of curriculum content and materials, teacher/student interaction, grading, and handling classroom disruption that begin to make the vision seem possible. Holt pays perhaps too little attention to the need for building new expectations among teachers and students of what "going to school" amounts to, and we recommend Goodlad's Dynamics of Educational Change for that dimension of the situation.

Kohl, Herbert. On Teaching. New York: Schocken Books. 1976.

In a book which makes improvement of teaching and school climate a matter of intent, hard work, and careful attention (not innate creativity, warmth, or inspiration), the last chapter, "The Politics of Teaching," offers advice and illustrations for managing alternative approaches within the context of an existing organization, where hierarchy, policy, and other facets of the school as an organization are a fact of life.

Lieberman, Ann, ed. Tell Us What To Do! But Don't Tell Me What To Do! Dayton, Ohio: I/D/E/A. 1971.

Prepared by teachers, this is one of a series of books on the experience of the League of Cooperating Schools in Southern California as it worked for five years with John Goodlad to make the member schools more satisfying places to teach and to learn. Teachers pull no punches in this account of their efforts to act as and be treated as knowledgeable colleagues.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE ISSUES: BACKGROUND

Berger, Michael. Violence in the Schools: Causes and Remedies. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1974.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Human Characteristics and School Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Bird, Tom, et al. Design for Youth Development Policy, Revised. Prepared for DHEW, Youth Development Bureau, Boulder, Colorado: Center for Action Research, Inc., 1978.

Cardarelli, Albert P. The Theory and Practice of Delinquency Prevention in the United States. Center for Vocational Education: Ohio State University, 1975.

Children's Defense Fund. Children Out of School in America. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project, Inc., 1974.

Children's Defense Fund. School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? Cambridge, Massachusetts: Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project, Inc., 1975.

Cicourel, Aaron V. and John I. Kitsuse. The Educational Decision-Makers. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

Elliott, Delbert S. and Harlan Voss. Delinquency and Dropout. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Co., 1974.

Fizzel, Robert L. "Who Succeeds in School?" Changing Schools 3, #15 (April):5-7, 1976.

Jennings, Wayne and Joe Nathan. "Startling/Disturbing Research on School Program Effectiveness." Phi Delta Kappa (March):567-572, 1977.

Murray, Charles. The Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency: Current Theory and Knowledge. Executive Summary. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (April)1976.

National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Preventing Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Delinquency Prevention Theory (Vol. I of IX). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1977.

Neill, Shirley Boes. Violence and Vandalism. Education U.S.A. Special Report, 1975.

Polk, Kenneth and Walter Shafer. Schools and Delinquency. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Schrag, Peter and Diane Divoky. "Learning Disabilities: Education's Newest Growth Industry?" The National Elementary Principal 55, #4 (March-April):7-18, 1976.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

Smith, Vernon and George H. Gallus. What the People Think About Their Schools: Gallup's Findings. Fastback Series, No. 94. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

U.S. Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Challenge For the Third Century: Education in a Safe Environment--Final Report on the Nature and Prevention of School Violence and Vandalism. Washington, D.C., 1977.

Weinstock, Ruth. The Greening of the High School. Dayton, Ohio: Educational Facilities Laboratory and the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, 1973.

Wenk, Ernst. "Schools and Delinquency Prevention". Crime and Delinquency Literature. (June)1974.

THE ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION MOVEMENT

Abramson, Paul. "Alternative Schools. They're the Rage and a Reasonable one. How One Public School District Offers a Variety of Alternative Programs." American School Board Journal 162 (October): 38-40, 1975.

Allen, Harvey A. "Alternatives in Education: A Bibliography." The Clearing House 48 (April):491-496, 1974.

"All About Alternatives." Nation's Schools 90 (November):33-39, 1972.

Alternate Learning Center. Alternate Learning Center Abstracts of Inservice Training Programs. Providence, Rhode Island Department of Education.

"Alternatives in Public Education--Movement or Fad?" NASSP Bulletin 57 (September):1-126, 1973.

Arnove, Robert and Toby Strout. "Alternative Programs for Disruptive Youth." Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Arons, Stephen, et al. Alternative Schools: A Practical Manual. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1971.

Barr, Robert D. "The Growth of Alternative Public Schools: The 1975 ICOPE Report." Changing Schools 12 (4 March):2-10, 1975.

Barr, Robert D., et al. "All About Alternatives." Nation's Schools 90 (November):33-39, 1972.

Bergen, Kathy. "Urbana's Education II: A Student-Directed Alternative to the Traditional High School." Illinois School Board Journal (May-June):26-30, 1975.

Blackman, N. "Metro: Experimental High School Without Walls: Chicago." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 55 (May):147-150, 1971.

Bournazos, Kimon, et al. The Street Academy: Final Evaluation Report. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Information Services, Inc., 1975.

Bremer, John and Michael Von Moschzisker. The School Without Walls: Philadelphia's Parkway Program. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Brownson, B. "Alternative Schools and the Problem of Change: School is a School is a School is a School." Contemporary Education 44 (April):298-303, 1973.

Brunetti, Gerald. "Alternative Schools: Can They Survive?" The Clearing House 48 (January):267-271, 1974.

Center for New Schools. "Strengthening Alternative High Schools." Harvard Educational Review 42, #3 (August):313-350, 1972.

Changing Schools: An Occasional Newsletter on Alternative Public Schools. Bloomington, Indiana: Center for Options in Public Education, Indiana University.

Cleare, Mary Jane and Roy D. Nichols, Jr. "Alternative or Copout?" NASSP Bulletin 57(September):20-25, 1973.

Cohn, Marilyn R. and Mary Ellen Finch. The Public Alternative High School: I. Solution to or Reflection of Societal Ills? Washington, DC: Council on Anthropology and Education, 1975.

Commission on Schools. Policies and Standards for the Approval of Optional Schools and Special Function Schools. North Central Association, 1974.

Deal, Terrence E. "An Organizational Explanation of the Failure of the Alternative Secondary Schools." Educational Researcher 4(April): 10-17, 1975.

Dennison, George. The Lives of Children. New York: Random House, 1969.

DeTurk, Philip and Robert Mackin. Alternative School Development: A Guide for Practitioners. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1974.

Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Highlights from a Joint Feasibility Study of Alternative Education. St. Paul, Minnesota: Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, 1974.

Ellison, Martha. "The Brown School, Louisville, Kentucky." Changing Schools 1, #13(April):3-4, 1975.

English, Fenwick W. "Freedom Hall: An Alternative School." Phi Delta Kappa 55(June):683-684, 1974.

ESP, Barbara. "Program Evaluation in Alternative Education: An Annotated Bibliography." Teacher Education Forum 4(June):17-24, 1976.

Fairfax County Public Schools. Alternative Education Programs Within Elementary Schools: A Review of the Programs in Major School Systems. Fairfax, Virginia: Fairfax County Public Schools, 1975.

Fantini, Mario. Alternative Education: A Source Book for Parents, Teachers, Students, and Administrators. New York: Doubleday, 1976.

Fantini, Mario D. The People and Their Schools: Community Participation. Fastback Series, No. 62. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1975.

Fantini, Mario D. Public Schools of Choice: A Plan for the Reform of American Education. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1973.

Florida Department of Education. Legislative Report on Alternative Education Programs for Disruptive Students. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Department of Education, 1974.

Ford Foundation. Matters of Choice: A Ford Foundation Report on Alternative Schools. New York: Ford Foundation, 1974.

"Getting into Alternatives, People, Places, and Books." National Elementary Principal 52(April):105-108, 1973.

Glatthorn, Allan A. Alternatives in Education: Schools and Programs. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, Inc., 1975.

Glatthorn, Alan A. "Decision Making in Alternative Schools." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 57(September): 110-119, 1973.

Goodlad, John I., et al. The Conventional and the Alternative in Education. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.

Grubard, Allen. Alternative Education: The Free School Movement in the United States. Stanford University URIC Clearinghouse on Educational Media and Technology, 1972.

Harvard Educational Review. A Special Issue on Alternative Schools. Vol. 42, #3(August), 1972.

Hill, Edward E. "Solving Administrative Problems in Alternative Schools." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 57 (September):83-88, 1973.

Indiana Department of Public Instruction. Total Education: A Report of the 1974 Conference on Educational Alternatives. Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Public Instruction, 1974.

International Consortium for Options in Public Education. Directory of Alternative Public Schools, 1975. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1975.

Jones, Philip G. "How to Pick the Right Kind (or Kinds) of Alternative School for Your Community." The American School Board Journal (January):31-36, 1976.

Lathan, Dorothy N. Rooftop School: An Evaluation of an Alternative School. San Francisco: San Francisco Unified School District, 1974.

McCauley, Brian L., et al. Evaluation and Authority in Alternative Schools and Public Schools. Palo Alto, California: Stanford University, 1972.

McGrady, Donna S. "Schools Without Walls: Selected Readings." Audio-visual Instruction 17(September):45pp., 1972.

Nathan, Joe. "Alternative Schools: The Less Traveled Road." Teacher (April):60-63, 1978.

Natriello, Gary and Venables, Thomas J., eds. Alternative Education: An Annotated Bibliography. Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey State Department of Education, 1974.

Nelson, Ralph T. "Helpful Hints for Your High School's Alternative Program." Educational Leadership 31(May):716-721, 1974.

Osborn, Charles David. "Alternative Schools as Holding Power." Hossier School Master 13(November):4-5, 1973.

Paskal, Dolores. "Can Options Work in Smaller School Districts?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 57(September): 47-54, 1973.

Paskal, Dolores and William Miller. "Managing Controversy About Optional and Alternative Programs." Educational Leadership (October):14-16, 1975.

Penha, James and John Azrak. The Learning Community. Paramus, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1975.

Phi Delta Kappan. Special Issue: Alternative Schools. Vol. LIV, No. 7 (March), 1973.

Pirsing, N. "Bumpy Road to the Open School: Minnesota's St. Paul Open School." American Education 8(October):17-23, 1972.

Pursell, William. A Conservative Alternative School: The A+ School in Cupertino. Fastback Series, No. 67. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Riordan, Robert C. Alternative Schools in Action. Fastback Series, No. 11, Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

St. Germain, Richard, Roger D. Carten, and James Meland. "Roseville Faces Disaffection With Alternative High Schools." Phi Delta Kappan LVI(May):637-638, 1975.

Smith, Vernon H. "Alternative Public Schools: What Are They?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 57(September): 4-9, 1973.

Smith, Vernon, Robert Barr, and Daniel Burke. Alternatives in Education: Freedom to Choose. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.

Terrell, Henry W. "Alternative Schools: What Kind of Students Do They Attract?" Phi Delta Kappan 56(May):635-636, 1975.

Umans, Shelly. "Options in Large School Districts." National Association of Secondary School Principals 57(September):42-46, 1973.

White, William. "Fiscal Aspects of Alternative Schools." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 57(September): 99-102, 1973.

EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Arms, Myron and David Denman. Touching the World: Adolescents, Adults, and Action Learning. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1975.

Baldridge, J. Victor. "The Impact of Individuals, Organizational Structure, and Environment on Organizational Innovation." R&D Memorandum No. 124. Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University. 1974.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Organizational Change Processes: A Bibiography with Commentary. Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching. 1970.

Baldridge, J. Victor and Terrence E. Deal, eds. Managing Change in Educational Organizations: Sociological Perspectives, Strategies, and Case Studies. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation. 1975.

Becker, James M. and Carole L. Hahn. Wingspread Workbook for Educational Change. SSEC publication no. 180. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc. 1977

Bentzen, Mary M. and Kenneth A. Tye. "Effecting Change in Elementary Schools." In The Elementary School in the United States, Seventy-Second Yearbook, Part II, chapter 14. Edited by John I. Goodlad and Harold G. Shane. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1973.

Berchuck, Irving and Vita Tauss. "The Opening Classroom: Guiding the Transition From Traditional to Open Classroom." Elementary School Journal 74 (November): 78-83. 1973.

Berman, Paul and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Supporting Educational Change: A Model of Educational Change. Vol. 1. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation. 1975.

Berman, Paul and Edward Pauley. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: Factors Affecting Change Agent Projects. Vol. 2. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation. 1975.

Berman, Paul and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Prepared for U.S. Office of Education, DHEW. Santa Monica; Rand Corporation. 1978.

Carlson, Richard O., et al. Change Process in the Public Schools. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon. 1965.

Carlson, Richard O., et al. The Diffusion of Educational Innovations: Recommendations for Policy Makers and Administrators. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc. 1975.

CFK, Ltd. School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator. Tulsa: Cadre.

Citizen Action in Education. Quarterly Journal of the Institute for Responsive Education, Boston, Massachusetts.

Clasby, Miriam and Joanne Lema. Together: Schools and Communities. Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education. 1975.

Culver, Carmen M. and Gary J. Hoban, eds. The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1973.

Cunningham, L.L. "Educational Reform and the Principal." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 54 (November): 1-23. 1970.

Davies, Don, ed. Schools Where Parents Make a Difference. Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education. 1976.

Drag, Lillian K. "A Bibiography on the Process of Change." In The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator. Edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1973.

Fader, Daniel. The Naked Children. New York: Bantam Books. 1971.

Fader, Daniel, James Duggins, Tom Finn, and Elton McNiel. The New Hooked on Books. New York: Berkley Publishing Co. 1976.

Ford Foundation. A Foundation Goes to School: The Ford Foundation Comprehensive School Improvement Program, 1960-1970. New York: Ford Foundation. 1972.

Freedman, Philip I. and Sue Freedman. "Is An Innovative School a Useful School?" Phi Delta Kappan (February): 415-416. 1976.

Fullan, Michael, ed. "Innovations in Learning and Processes of Educational Change." Interchange. Vol. 3, #s 2-3. Ontario, Canada: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. 1972.

Fullan, Michael and Glenn Eastbrook. School Change Project: Interim Report of Findings. Toronto, Canada: Department of Sociology, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (April.) 1973.

Gartner, Alan and Frank Riessman. How to Individualize Learning. Fastback Series, no. 100. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Gartner, Alan, Mary Conway Kohler, and Frank Riessman. Children Teach Children: Learning by Teaching. New York: Harper and Row. 1971.

Giacquinta, Joseph B. "The Process of Organizational Change in Schools." In Review of Research in Education, Vol. 1, pp. 178-208. Edited By Fred N. Kerlinger. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock. 1973.

Glasser, William. "A New Look at Discipline." Learning (December): 6-11. 1974.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row. 1969

Goodlad, John I. The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1975.

Goodlad, John I. "Educational Change: A Strategy for Study and Action." National Elementary School Principal 48, #3 (January): 6-13. 1969.

Goodlad, John I. "The Individual School and Its Principal: Key Setting and Key Person in Educational Change." Educational Leadership 13 (October): 2-6. 1955.

Goodlad, John I. "In Pursuit of Visions." Elementary School Journal 59 (October): 1-17. 1958.

Greenwood, Peter W. and Dale Mann. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: The Process of Change. Vol. 3. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Gross, Neal, Joseph B. Giacquinta, and Marilyn Bernstein. Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books. 1971.

Harms, Thelma. "Change Agents in Curriculum--An Overview of Innovative Programs in American Schools for Young Children." Young Children 29 (July): 280-288. 1974.

Havelock, Ronald G. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications. 1973.

Hawes, Gene R. "Managing Open Education: Testing, Evaluation, and Accountability; Special Report." Nation's Schools 93 (June): 33-47. 1974.

House, Ernest R. The Politics of Educational Innovation. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation. 1974.

House, Ernest R. and Stephen D. Lapas. Survival in the Classroom. 1978

Howard, Gene. School Discipline Desk Book. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Cadre Publication Center, College of Education, University of Tulsa.

Howard, Gene and John Jenkins. Improving Discipline in the Secondary School. Tulsa: Cadre.

Howell, Bruce and Bill Grahlman. School Climate: Evaluation and Implementation. Tulsa: Cadre.

Isler, Richard E. Creating the Open Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers. Edited by Margaret F. Ishler. Buffalo, New York: D.O.K. Publishers, Inc. 1974.

Joyce, Bruce R. Alternative Models of Elementary Education. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company. 1969.

Kliebard, Herbert M. and Schmiedicke, Joseph E. "Educational Innovation and the National Interest." New York University Educational Quarterly 5 (Summer): 16-21. 1974.

Kohl, Herbert. "What are the Real Risks When a School Tries to Change?" Saturday Review 55 (May): 48-54. 1972.

Lippitt, Peggy. Students Teach Students. Fastback Series, no. 65. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation. 1975.

Lippitt, Ronald, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westley. Dynamics of Planned Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World. 1958.

McCarl, Robert, ed. Promising Practices in Small High Schools: A Report of 28 Northwest Projects, 1971. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Educational Laboratory. 1971.

McClure, Larry, et al. Experience-Based Learning: How to Make the Community Your Classroom. 1977.

MacDonald, W. Scott. Battle in the Classroom. Scranton: Intext Educational Publishers. 1971.

Marvin, Michael, et al. Planning Assistance Programs to Reduce School Violence and Disruption. Research for Better Schools. 1976.

Masters, James R., Grace E. Laverty, and Robert B. Hayes. The Effects of a School Without Failure Program Upon Classroom Interaction Patterns, Pupil Achievement, and Teacher, Pupil, and Parent Attitudes (Summary of a Two-Year Study). Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education. 1975.

Maynard, William. "The Impact of a Humanistic School Climate." National Association of Secondary School Principles Bulletin (April). 1976.

Maynard, William. "School Violence and Vandalism: An Alternative Approach." Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa. (January). 1978.

Maynard, William. "Working with 'Disruptive' Youth." ASCD Educational Leadership (March). 1977.

Mizzell, Hays. "Designing a Positive In-School Suspension Program." American Friends Service Committee, Southeastern Public Education Program. 1977.

National Commission on Resources for Youth. New Roles for Youth in the School and the Community. New York: Citation Press. 1974.

National Commission on Resources for Youth. Resources for Youth. (Newsletter.)

Olivera, James L. "Discipline . . . #1 Problem in the Schools? Forty Positive Preventative Prescriptions for Those Who Care. . ." Burlingame, California: Association of California School Administrators. (April).

Panko, Jessie Symington. "When Children Choose." National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal 1 (May):34-53.

Pincus, John. "Incentives for Innovation in the Public Schools." Review of Educational Research 44 (Winter)"113-114. 1974.

Postman, Niel and Charles Weingarner. How to Recognize a Good School. Fastback Series, No. 30. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Rand Corporation. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: The Findings in Review. Vol. 4. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Ringers, Joseph, Jr. Community Schools and Interagency Programs.

Rist, Ray C. Restructuring American Education: Innovations and Alternatives. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. 1972.

Samples, Bob, et al. The Wholeschool Book. Addison-Wesley. 1977

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. 1971.

Scanlon, Robert G. Building Relationships for the Dissemination of Innovations. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Schmuck, Richard A., et al. Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon.

Smith, Louis M. and Pat M. Keith. Anatomy of Educational Innovation: An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School. New York: Wiley.

Temkin, Sanford, ed. What Do Research Findings Say About Getting Innovations Into Schools: A Symposium. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc. 1974.

Tucker, Marc, et al. Building Capacity for Renewal and Reform: An Initial Report on Knowledge Production and Utilization in Education. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education (December).

Tye, Kenneth A. and Jerrold M. Novotney. Schools in Transition: The Practitioner as Change Agent. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1975.

Wenk, Ernst and Nora Harlow (eds.) School Crime and Disruption: Prevention Models, Washington, DC: National Institute of Education (June).

"What Schools Are Doing: A Roundup of New and Unusual School Practices." Nation's Schools 91 (June:49-51.

Wigginton, Eliot. Moments: The Foxfire Experience. Star Press. 1975.

Williams, Catherine. The Community as Textbook. Fastback Series, No. 64. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Williams, Richard D., et al. Effecting Organizational Renewal in Schools: A Social Systems Perspective.

FUNDING

Education Funding News. Educational Funding Research Council, 725 National Press, NW, Washington, DC, 20004.

Grantsmanship Center News. The Grantsmanship Center, 1015 W. Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. 90015

TEACHER EDUCATION

Barr, Robert D. and Daniel J. Burke. "New Teachers for New Schools." Viewpoints 49 (July):63-75. 1973

Goodlad, John I. "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education." Teacher's College Record 72 (September):61-72.

Jackson, Philip W. and Egon Guba. "The Needed Structure of In-Service Teachers: An Occupational Analysis." School Review 65 (June):176-192.

Holt, John. What Do I Do Monday? New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc. 1970.

Kohl, Herbert. On Teaching. New York: Schocken Books. 1976.

Levin, Corrinne and Horwitz, Robert. "The Teacher Center, Inc. (New Haven, Connecticut): A Case Study." Educational Leadership 33 (March):434-439.

Lieberman, Ann, ed. Tell Us What to Do! But Don't Tell Me What to Do! Dayton, Ohio: I/D/E/A/.

Rubin, Louis. i.e. Inservice Training of Teachers: Trends, Processes and Prescriptions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1978.

Solo, Leonard. "Teacher Evaluation in an Alternative Public School." National Elementary Principal 55 (September-October):29-34. 1975.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION AS TOOLS OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Burges, Bill. Facts and Figures: A Layman's Guide to Conducting Surveys. Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education.

Burges, Bill. Facts for a Change: Citizen Action Research for Better Schools. Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education.

Ferriera, Josephand Bill Burges. Collecting Evidence: A Layman's Guide to Participant Observation. Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education.

Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry. Scranton, Pennsylvania: Chandler.

* U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979 - 281-380/1618